Research Note 84-42

THE ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION IN ABSENCE BEHAVIOR

Daniel R. Ilgen and John H. Hollenback
Purdue University

T. Owen Jacobs, Contracting Officer's Representative

Submitted by

Robert M. Sasmor, Director
BASIC RESEARCH

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

February 1984

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER: Research Note 84-42	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.: AD-A138087
3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER:	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle): THE ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION IN ABSENCE BEHAVIOR	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: Interim Report Series 1975-1976
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER:
7. AUTHOR(s): Daniel R. Ilgen and John H. Hollenback	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s): DAHC19-74-G-0002
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: Purdue Research Foundation, Division of Sponsored Programs, Hovede Hall, West LaFayette, IN 47907	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS: 2Q161102B74F
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333	12. REPORT DATE: February 1984
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 25
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office):	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report): Unclassified
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE:

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Absence behavior, job satisfaction, pressure variables, additive model, moderated model, regression model, intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Two models of absence behaviors were compared. The first considered absence behavior as a function of job satisfaction. Additional pressures toward attendance, both internal (the individual's value system) and external (co-workers' and job structure) as well as four demographic variables were considered as moderators of the absenteeism-job satisfaction relationship. These additional pressures were termed role pressures. The second model considered absenteeism as a function of role pressures and job satisfaction in an additive rather than

(continued)

a moderated fashion. Only the additive model was supported. The data were discussed in light of the process of role pressures for attendance. This report is fourth in a 1975-1976 series entitled "Sources and Effects of Accurate Work Perceptions."

The Role of Job Satisfaction in Absence Behavior

From the organization's standpoint absenteeism is an important behavior. Due to its importance there has been considerable interest in it. (See, for example, reviews by Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Gibson, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Porter & Steers, 1973; and Vroom, 1964.)[1] The research is almost exclusively correlational, and the variables correlated with absence behavior fall into two general classes. First, absences are correlated with biographical, individual differences such as age (Cooper & Payne, 1959), family size (Naylor & Vincent, 1959), tenure (Baumgartel & Sobol, 1959), and sex (Isambert-Jamati, 1962). The second approach has been to correlate measures of job satisfaction with absence behavior. In general these studies have related absenteeism to satisfaction with the job, organization-wide factors (e.g., pay and promotion), immediate work enviornment factors (e.g., supervision and working conditions), and job content factors (e.g., Task repetitiveness, autonomy, and responsibility). (See Porter & Steers, 1973, and Vroom, 1964, for reviews focusing on job satisfaction).

Of the two general sources of absenteeism data -- biographical and job satisfaction -- the latter assumes a process model which is seldom made explicit.

---

[1] The interest in absenteeism should not imply a consensus on what constitutes absence behavior. For example, very different patterns or results have been found when absences were defined as the frequency of absences than when defined as the duration of absence (Metzner & Mann, 1953). At this point in our discussion we will use absences in the more generic sense to include all avoidable absences from the job; the exception would be those due to known illnesses. Later in the article we will address specific types of absenteeism.

It assumes employees approach situations anticipated to lead to satisfaction and avoid situations perceived to lead to dissatisfaction. It is reasoned that the higher the satisfaction with the job the less the tendency to withdraw temporarily from the job by being absent. In this case, attitudes about the job are viewed as antecedents of behavior. This implies that, if the employee's attitudes are known, his absence behavior can be predicted.

The research on the job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship is inconclusive; sometimes the two are correlated, other times they are not. (See Porter and Steer's recent review, 1973). This lack of a strong correlation between job attitudes and absence behavior brings into question the general assumption that temporary withdrawal from the job is caused by dissatisfaction with the job.

Two general theoretical explanations pertain to the low observed correlations aside from the obvious one that the measures of job satisfaction and/or of absenteeism have not been satisfactory. The first assumes that the model which views attitudes as antecedents of behaviors is correct. This position argues that the low correlation between attitudes and behavior is due to external constraints which influence behavior and do not allow the individual to behave in line with his/her attitudes. Herman (1973) developed this position as it relates to the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. She argued that the low correlation found between job satisfaction and behavior across a large number of studies (cf., Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964) may have been due to the fact that many investigators looked at this relationship in settings where the individuals had only limited control over their performance behavior. An extreme example is the assembly line. Here an individual's performance is almost exclusively a function of factors beyond his control and, therefore, no relationship should be expected between performance and job satisfaction. Herman demonstrated that when external constraints on behavior were removed by secret ballots in a union election, voting behavior was

predictable from attitudes about unionization. In a similar view, Dansereau, Cashman and Graen (1974) hypothesized that one of the constraints influencing turnover was the individual's perception of the availability of suitable jobs. Their data showed that for those who felt other jobs were likely to be available, the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover was significantly higher than for those who did not perceive alternative jobs to be as readily available.

For both Herman and Dansereau et al. a strong relationship between attitudes and behaviors was assumed to exist and other factors influencing behavior were conceptualized as moderator variables. If the influence of external constraints on behavior is absent, job satisfaction should influence job behaviors; if the constraints are present, the job satisfaction-behavior relationship is decreased. In the case of absence behavior, the more that absenteeism is influenced by factors beyond the control of the individual the smaller should be the job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship.

An alternative explanation for the low correlations observed between job satisfaction and absenteeism behavior considers the decision to attend as a function of several factors in addition to satisfaction with the job. Variables assumed to be related to absence behavior would not be considered moderators of the job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship but would be considered independent influences on attendance behavior.

This model is most similar to that presented by Graen (1969) when he extended the Expectancy Theory model of Vroom (1964) to include internal and external role pressures. These pressures were assumed to add additional force toward the behavior in question. With regards to absence behavior, this position argues that satisfaction with the job provides only one force to attend. Other independent forces or pressures are present in the job setting which do not necessarily interact with satisfaction. This position assumes that a high correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism should not be expected

because, even under low constraints, the decision to attend on a daily basis is only slightly related to one's job satisfaction.

With respect to other variables in addition to job satisfaction which influence absenteeism behavior, the two explanations offered above employ very different strategies. In the first case, other influences on absenteeism behavior are viewed as constraints modifying the absenteeism-job satisfaction relationship. It is assumed that if the constraints were removed absenteeism behavior could ultimately be explained by job satisfaction. The second approach considers the potential correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism as very limited in most work settings and views other variables as additional influences of absenteeism behavior. In the latter case, such variables are independent predictors to be combined with job satisfaction in an additive model, such as a regression model, in order to predict absenteeism. The purpose of the present study was to compare these two models for the prediction of absenteeism behavior.

Method

Procedure

Clerical workers in several departments at Purdue University participated in the study. All clerical workers within the selected departments (see below for the bases of departmental selection) were informed of the general purpose of the study, then were sent a questionnaire in April 1973. For those who returned them, their attendance data were obtained from the personnel office for the six month time period following the administration of the questionnaire. Finally, those who had remained on the same job and who had returned a questionnaire were readministered the same questionnaire in November 1973 and again in May 1974. The data reported here deal with the responses on the first administration of the questionnaire and the attendance behavior from April to November 1973 because high turnover made successive samples unrepresentative of the population.

Measures

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by the complete Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The scale contains twenty subscales each with five items. The scale was used in order to measure satisfaction with several intrinsic and several extrinsic job factors. Intrinsic job factors are those which are provided to the individual by some agent (e.g., co-workers, supervisors, or the organization) in the work setting.

The booklet for scoring the MSQ gives an intrinsic and an extrinsic subtotal score. However, the subscales which comprise the two dimensions include several job factors that do not fit the more recent distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic job facets. For example, authority is considered an intrinsic factor. Although this is consistent with Herzberg's classification (Herzberg, Mausner, & Syndermen, 1959) it is not consistent with the more recent distiction between intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Therefore, the following subscales were used to define intrinsic satisfaction: ability utilization, achievement, creativity, and responsibility. Extrinsic satisfaction was defined by: company policy and practices, compensation, co-workers, security, social status, supervision-- human relations, supervision - technical, working conditions. Total job satisfaction was the sum of the twenty subscale scores of the MSQ.

Test-retest reliabilities for the three satisfaction scores over six month and one year periods are shown in Table 1. Given the length of the time period, these reliabilities were considered very satisfactory. The correlation of Intrinsic satisfaction with Extrinsic satisfaction on the April 1973 administration of the scale was (r = .64, N = 165) indicating that the subscales shared a considerable amount of common variance.

Role pressures. Role pressures were indexed by two sets of measures. First biographical data were collected as indices of role pressures on the

Table 1

Test-Retest Reliabilities of Satisfaction and Pressure Measures

	Correlations of April 1973 with November 1973 Measures (N ≐ 100)	Correlations of November 1973 with May 1974 Measures (N ≐ 82)	Correlations of April 1973 with May 1974 Measures (N ≐ 82)
Satisfaction			
MSQ Intrinsic	.66[a]	.69	.60
MSQ Extrinsic	.61	.65	.56
MSQ Total	.67	.65	.62
Pressure			
Value System	.68	.70	.69
Co-worker	.48	.58	.53
Job Structure	.63	.67	.64
Total Pressure	.62	.66	.72

[a]for all r's, $p < .001$

individuals due to such off-the-job factors as their family responsibilities. The second set of pressure measures were based upon job and value system pressures the participants felt in the work setting. Each set is described below.

Biographical measures: Four biographical measures were obtained. These were age, number of children living at home, whether or not these children were under seven years old, and, if married, whether or not their husband was a student. The last item was included because the university employs a large number of student's wives and it was thought that academic schedules which create several time periods during the year when students are on vacation might influence absence behavior of students' wives.

Perceived pressure variables: Three variables were designed to measure several sources of pressure on the women to attend work not reflected by biographical variables. With one exception, all items were measured with five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The first of these dealt with the pressure for attendance created by the job structure. Job Structure Pressure was defined by two items. The first asked the degree to which other clerical workers in the same department completed the individual's work when she was absent. It was reasoned that the more that work piled up on the job during her absence, the more pressure there should be for attendance in order to avoid having to work harder the first few days back on the job. This job pressure item was:

a. If I am absent, I have to work harder the first day or so when I get back due to the work that piled up in my absence.

The second job pressure item described five types of job structures for clerical jobs in this setting. These descriptions were based upon interviews with clerical staff and are listed below:

A. Individual secretaries are assigned to specific professors, individuals,

or specific functions. They work only on work from those persons or areas. If a secretary is absent the work piles up. Only work that has to get done immediately would be given to someone else in her absence.

B. Individual secretaries are loosely assigned to specific professors, individuals, or projects. However, work is often distributed without regard for these assignments. Often, when one person has a lot of work, some of this is distributed to others who are less busy.

C. Secretaries generally operate as a pool. However, members of the pool are often assigned to specific projects for a few days or weeks and during this time are pulled out of the pool.

D. Secretaries operate as a pool. New work loads are distributed to whomever is least busy.

E. Secretaries are assigned specific professors, individuals, or specific functions in teams of two or three. Each secretary within the team works on specific projects, but if she is behind or is absent the other team members do her work when they have the time.

The respondents chose the one response which best described their job. For scoring purposes the item was coded in the following manner: A = 5; B, C, or E = 3; and D = 1. This score was then added to the one Likert item above.

A second pressure variable was called Value System Pressure. This was designed to measure the extent to which the individual believed that absence was wrong. Value pressure was measured by the following items:

a. I believe that, once you accept a job, you are obligated to go to work unless you absolutely cannot make it.

b. As long as I have sick leave days available, I see nothing wrong with using them as I wish. (reverse scored)

c. When someone is absent without a good reason, I dislike doing their work for them.

A final pressure variable measured the extent to which co-workers accepted absence behavior. Three items defined Co-workers Pressure:

a. Even on days when I would rather stay home, I come to work because I feel a strong loyalty to the people I work for.

b. On days I would rather stay home, I come to work because I know if I am not here the other secretaries with whom I work will have to work harder.

c. Many people with whom I work use sick leave days for their own convenience rather than for illness. (reverse scored)

d. Most people I work with do not mind filling in for someone who is absent for any reason. (reverse scored)

A final pressure score, Total Pressure, was created by adding the pressure variables. Table 1 gives the test-retest reliabilities for each of the pressure variables.

Sample

The sample consisted of clerical workers who worked in thirteen different academic or administrative departments of the university. The departments were selected at random with one exception. An attempt was made to select departments that varied along the dimension of job structure for their clerical staff. In order to investigate the effect of job structure pressure, the sampling attempted to have departments that used a secretarial pool (low job structure pressure) as well as the more typical structure in which one secretary worked for several professors. Therefore, two departments known to have secretarial pools were included and not selected randomly. For those departments or administrative units included in the sample, all full-time secretaries in the department, not in supervisory positions, were included. The selected departments employed from 4 to 35 clerical workers. Two hundred forty-three questionnaires were mailed out and one hundred seventy-seven were returned

which represented seventy-three percent of the sample.

Absenteeism

Absenteeism was defined by the total time absent in the period from 28 April 1973 to 13 November 1973. From the university personnel records it was possible to break this down into the number of hours of sick leave used during the time period and the number of hours of unexcused absences. These hours were converted to a ratio of number of hours absent over total number of hours possible to work because many (52) of our sample quit before the end of this six month time period. For turnovers, the divisor was the number of possible hours for work from the 28th of April to the day they quit.

Three absence measures were used: amount of sick leave, unexcused absences, and total absences. Unexcused absences were all absences for which the individual did not use sick leave. No attempt was made to judge whether the absence was really unexcused. To consider all absences other than sick leave unexcused was a conservative strategy which may have decreased the strength of the results. However, we did not want to rely on reported reasons of unexcused absences in order to make some decision on the legitimacy of the absence. In most work settings, to implement company policies about what is and is not an unexcused absence usually yields some complex mixture of the integrity and the creativity of the work force rather than an accurate measure of truly unexcused absences.

All absence measures represented only measures of duration rather than the frequency of absence. Some data exist which show that frequency is a better measure than duration (Metzer & Mann, 1953). Unfortunately, it was not possible to obtain frequency data from the records available in the study. However, to remove the bias in the sick leave measure created by those who had been absent for long periods of time, it was decided to eliminate from the sample all those whose length of absence for sickness was greater than +3

standard deviations above the mean. The cut-off was based on an inspection of the sick leave data which showed 11 individuals who fell well outside the distribution of the rest of the sample. Therefore, the primary data analyses were based upon a sample of 166 of which missing data on specific scales reduced the number for some of the correlations presented.

Results

Zero-Order Correlations

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the satisfaction, role pressure, and absence measures, and Table 3 presents the intercorrelations of these measure. Several of these correlations are of interest.

First, none of the satisfaction measures correlated significantly with any of the absence behaviors. Although significant correlations have been found in previous research, the lack of any significant zero-order correlations is not inconsistent with either the moderated or the additive models considered in this study.

Three of the four biographical variables correlated significantly with one or more of the absence measures. Older women used less unexcused absences and were absent less overall than were younger women although the latter correlation was due primarily to the contribution of unexcused absences to the total amount of absenteeism.

Women whose husbands were students used significantly more sick leave than those whose husbands were not, and their total number of absences also were higher. It was predicted that this subgroup would be more likely to be absent; it was not predicted that they would choose sick leave rather than unexcused absences when not attending work. However, since this subgroup was a transient one comprised of individuals who typically live in the community only for the time

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Job Satisfaction, Pressure, Biographical, and Absenteeism Measures

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Job Satisfaction			
MSQ Intrinsic	75.02	14.68	165
MSQ Extrinsic	141.64	23.71	165
MSQ Total	366.48	56.02	164
Biographical Variables			
Age (1=16-24; 2=25-29; 3=30-39; 4=40-49; 5=> 49)	2.31	1.53	165
Husband a student? (1=yes; 2=no)	1.18	0.83	165
Number of Children	.61	1.11	165
Number of children under 7 years old	.15	0.35	165
Pressure Variable			
Value System	11.08	2.10	165
Co-workers	13.09	2.07	165
Job Structure	8.14	1.82	154
Total	32.32	4.16	153
Absenteeism			
Sick Leave	0.031	0.017	166
Unexcused Absences	0.013	0.035	141
Total Absences	0.045	0.038	141

Table 3

Intercorrelations of Job Satisfaction, Biographical Pressure and Absenteeism Measures[a,b]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Satisfaction (MSQ)[a]													
1. Intrinsic		64[e]	89[e]	29[e]	-09	09	-02	28[e]	29[e]	-01	26[e]	01	-10
2. Extrinsic			89[e]	27[e]	06	16[c]	-01	21[d]	28[e]	-06	21[d]	05	-10
3. Total				33[e]	09	15[c]	-02	27[e]	35[e]	-03	28[e]	03	-09
Biographical Data													
4. Age					27[e]	27[e]	-10	43[e]	30[e]	21[d]	44[e]	-06	-20[d]
5. Husband Student?						38[e]	12	09	11	03	13	-26[e]	-07
6. Number of Children at Home							14	23[d]	13	06	22[d]	-10	-02
7. Children Under 7 years old								10	10	09	16[c]	-09	15[c]
Pressure Variables													
8. Value System									45[e]	17[c]	80[e]	-15[c]	07
9. Co-worker										03	74[e]	-02	20[d]
10. Job Structure											54[e]	-20[d]	-11
11. Total												-15	10
Absenteeism													
12. Sick Leave													-04
13. Unexcused													
14. Total													

[a]Ns = 165 except for correlations with the following:
N = 164 for MSQ total
N = 154 for Job Structure Pressure
N = 153 for Total Job Pressure
N = 141 for Unexcused and Total Absences

[b]Decimals omitted.

[c] $p < .05$

[d] $p < .01$

[e] $p < .001$

their husbands are inschool, it is quite possible that they felt little need to accumulate sick leave for possible use in the distant future and/or they were less committed to the organization and more willing to use sick leave regardless of the actual reason for absence. Both interpretations are consistent with the observed correlations.

The third biographical variable of interest to absenteeism is family responsibility -- specifically the number of children. Only the number of children under seven significantly correlated with any form of absence behavior. Those who had children under seven used more unexcused absences than did those who did not have children in this age range. As was predicted, children only affect absence behavior when they are at the age which demands adult care.

Turning to the perceived pressure variables measured, all were directly related to some form of absence behavior. First, the internal pressure from their value system did influence the use of sick leave. The greater the pressure, the less they used sick leave. Second, there was a positive correlation between co-worker pressure and unexcused absences. The direction of this correlation becomes interpretable upon closer inspection of the measure of co-worker pressure. One of the items deals only with pressure <u>not</u> to use sick leave. therefore, the more the women perceived a norm for using sick leave only when they were actually sick, the more they tended to use unexcused absences when they wanted to miss work. The perception of co-worker pressure did not influence the total number of absences, but it did influence how the absence behavior was manifested.

Job structure pressure, as predicted, also influenced absenteeism. There were fewer total hours absent and fewer hours of sick leave used by those who felt their job demanded their presence.

<u>Moderated vs. Additive Prediction</u>

The major focus of the study was to compare pressure variables as moderators

of the satisfaction-absenteeism relationship to their use in an additive model for the prediction of absenteeism. For the moderated prediction, the sample was split at the median on each of the following measures: Value System Pressure, Co-worker Pressure, Job Structure Pressure, Total Pressure, Age, and number of children living at home. In addition, the sample was divided once for each of two dichotomous variables -- whether or not their husband was a student, and whether or not they had children under seven years old. For all variables it was predicted that the correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism would be lower in magnitude when the pressures were high than when they were low.

For each factor mentioned above, nine correlations were calculated for those above the median (or, in the case of the two dichotomous variables, within the high category) and nine for below. These nine were intercorrelations of intrinsic, extrinsic, and total satisfaction with sick leave, unexcused absences, and total absences. The median correlations under low and high pressure conditions are reported in Table 4. The correlations on which the medians were based ranged from -.21 to +.15 under low pressure and from -.20 to +.29 under high. Only one of the eight moderator variables showed the predicted pattern of correlations, and this only occurred for two of the three absence measures. The job satisfaction of those who did not have children under seven years old significantly predicted unexcused and total absences. The correlations with unexcused absences were -.19, -.19, and -.20 for Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Total Job Satisfaction, respectively; those with Total Absences were -.19, -.15, and -.19. All were significant at the $p < .05$ level. In addition, all these correlations were significantly different from their matched correlation in the high pressure condition (having children under seven years old). None of the correlations in the latter group were significant.

In spite of the moderated effect for children under seven, overall, little support was found for the moderated effect. Only one of eight moderators was successful, and this one was successful for only two of the absence measures. Furthermore, those correlations observed under the low pressure condition, although significant, were quite low.

To investigate the additive model for comparison to the moderated one, multiple regression analyses were conducted. Table 5 presents these data for both types of role pressures separately and in combination. In general, the data support the additive interpretation. When knowledge of all forms of role pressure assessed in the study was added to job satisfaction, it was possible to predict all forms of absenteeism behavior, and these predictions held up when shrinkage was taken into account. Within types of role pressure, only perceived role pressures reliably predicted absenteeism, in this case Total Absences. None of the multiple correlations with biographical variables held up after shrinkage was taken into account.

Discussion

In the present sample, the conclusion must be reached that job satisfaction was, for the most part, unrelated to absenteeism. This was true when satisfaction was related directly to absenteeism and when the possibility of a moderated relationship was explored. Three competing explanations for the lack of relationship exist: the appropriate moderators were not measured, the measures were not sufficiently reliable or valid to detect a difference, or job satisfaction had very little relationship to absenteeism.

Whether or not the appropriate moderators were measured cannot be answered from the data. However, the moderators used were not selected haphazardly. The variables were chosen only after interviews with clerical staff and their supervisors and after critical evaluation of the role pressures likely to be present on the job. Therefore, it seems unlikely that all of the moderators were inappropriate.

Table 4

Median Correlations Between Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism under High and Low External Constraints as Measured by Pressure and Biographical Variables

Job Satisfaction (MSQ)	Sick Leave	Unexcused Absences	Total Absences
		Low Levels of Constraints	
Intrinsic	.01	-.08	-.11
Extrinsic	.07	-.15	-.11
Total	.06	-.14	-.11
		High Levels of Constraints	
Intrinsic	.02	-.06	-.08
Extrinsic	-.01	-.03	-.05
Total	.00	-.03	-.06

Table 5

Multiple Correlations of Job Satisfaction and Pressure Variables with Absenteeism Behavior

Predictor Variables	Obtained R			Shrunken R[a]		
	Absence Measures					
Satisfaction and Perceived Pressure	Sick Leave (N=153)	Unexcused Absences (N=130)	Total Absences (N=130)	Sick Leave	Unexcused Absences	Total Absences
1. MSQ Intrinsic, Value System, Co-worker, Job Structure Pressure	.24	.29[b]	.31[b]	.20	.25	.27[b]
2. MSQ Extrinsic, Value System, Co-worker, Job Structure Pressure	.24	.29[b]	.30[b]	.20	.25	.26[b]
3. MSQ Total, Value System, Co-worker, Job Structure Pressure	.24	.30[b]	.31[b]	.20	.26[b]	.27[b]
Satisfaction and Biographical Data						
4. MSQ Intrinsic, Age, Husband Student, No. of children, children < 7yrs. old	.27[b]	.25	.28[b]	.23	.18	.22
5. MSQ Extrinsic, Age, Husband Student, No. of children, children < 7yrs. old	.28[b]	.25	.28[b]	.22	.18	.22
6. MSQ Total, Age, Husband Student, No. of children, children < 7yrs. old	.27[b]	.24	.28[b]	.22	.17	.22
Satisfaction, Perceived Pressure, & Biographical Data						
7. MSQ Total, Value System, Co-worker, Job Structure Pressure, Age, Husband Student, No. of children, children < 7yrs. old	.36[c]	.39[c]	.41[c]	.30[b]	.32[b]	.35[b]

[a]Based upon Durket, 1964.

[b]$p < .05$

[c]$p < .01$

Several factors militate against the second alternative that the variables were insufficiently measured. First of all, the job satisfaction measure, the MSQ, has received extensive use and has been found to be reliable and valid (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Although in the present sample, test-retest reliabilities were only moderately high (see Table 1), it should be recalled that the time period between test administrations was considerably longer than is customary for test-retest reliability estimates. Furthermore, when the time period was extended to one year, the reliabilities still held up.

With regard to the absence behavior measures, it was pointed out earlier that Metzer and Mann (1953) found frequency of absence to be a more appropriate measure than duration. Although we were unable to measure frequency, it was felt that the removal of the eleven clerical workers with extended periods of sick leave (i.e., greater than +3.0 standard deviations above the mean on sick leave) should have left a duration measure which was highly correlated with frequency. Unfortunately, no adequate test of this supposition was available.

The strongest support for the adequacy of the absence behavior is its predictability from role pressure variables. Sick leave, unexcused absences, and total absences all were related in a theoretically meaningful fashion to one or more of the perceived pressure or biographical measures. Therefore, it cannot be argued that the absence measures were invalid.

We are left with the conclusion that job satisfaction was not very strongly associated with the absence behavior in this setting and may not be in many other settings. Although such a conclusion lacks the appeal of more contemporary values about the nature of work such as those in the H.E.W. report, Work in America (1973), the conclusion is not out of line with the data. Vroom (1964) reviewed ten studies relating job satisfaction to absenteeism and found a

range in correlations of only moderate strength. Porter and Steers (1973) updated this review and found very little work done in the last few years. Although they concluded that satisfaction was related to absenteeism, Porter and Steers tempered this conclusion by stating it was based on "preliminary evidence" (p. 167). When one considers that the reveiws are based primarily upon published articles and one takes into account the bias against publishing negative findings, the confidence in job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship is shaken even more.

In the face of unsupporting data, the tendency has been to question the validity of the absence measures or to assume that other factors controlled behavior so that the attitudes toward the job did not have a chance to influence it. However, the present study was unable to demonstrate a relationship between absenteeism and satisfaction when several of the possible outside factors were removed. Thus, it is time that the assumed relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism be questioned.

Two general views have been espoused about the causal relationship between job satisfaction and behavior. The first assumes that satisfaction causes the behavior; the second assumes that the behavior leads to satisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967; Pritchard, Kirk, & Mayo, 1975). Absenteeism usually has been assumed to follow the first model. This model stems from the social psychological literature which views attitudes as leading to an intention of an approach or avoidance behavior toward the attitude object (Triandis, 1971). With respect to absenteeism, this model assumes the greater the job satisfaction the greater the display of approach behavior toward the job in the form of attendance assuming thatt external constraints on attendance behavior are low.

The moderated correlations of the present study failed to support the satisfaction-to-absenteeism model. Yet, a closer look at many of the job

dimensions typically measured by job satisfaction scales leads one to question how attendance could ever be construed as an approach behavior resulting from satisfaction with these dimensions. For example, it is unlikely that satisfaction with pay, security, the company policy would lead to a greater desire for very regular attendance in organizations with liberal sick leave benefits or with seniority-based decisions about layoffs, promotions, and raises. In fact, company policies which allow for more frequent absences may provide a basis for greater satisfaction but certainly would not be expected to lead to greater attendance. Baum (personal communication) has found a positive correlation between absenteeism and the extent of overtime available. To the extent that availability of overtime increases satisfaction with pay, this would imply a positive correlation between pay satisfaction and attendance -- a prediction opposite of the satisfaction-to-behavior model. Likewise, if there is no reason to expect one's position with one's co-workers to be jeopardized by occasional absences, satisfaction with co-workers should not necessarily prevent occasional absences. It is hard to imagine the attractiveness of any work group being so strong that, if it administered no negative sanctions, its members would still desire to always be present for work. Only satisfaction with supervision appears to create a force toward attendance and, more than likely, this force is due primarily to the power the supervisor holds over the individual's attainment of valued rewards.

Theoretically intrinsic satisfaction with the work itself should create more of an intention to attend work. However, even under conditions of intense involvement with the job, absence behavior may occur. Professorial positions in university settings offer a good example of a job filled by members who possess relatively high intrinsic satisfactions and who experience very few sanctions for not being in the office or lab from 8:00 to 5:00 every

day. Yet, it is a rare professor, indeed, who does not occasionally wake up in the morning and consider and pursue other activities which are more attrative than going to the office or laboratory, in spite of the fact that he may be very satisfied with his work. Therefore, even for intrinsic job satisfaction, the assumption that absenteeism should be linearly related to job satisfaction appears to have been somewhat naive. A model that assumes that absence behavior results from the intended behavior of approaching the job due to the individual's satisfaction with it does not seem adequate for the explanation of absence behavior.

The second model assumes that attendance behavior leads to satisfaction to the extent that rewards are contingent upon attendance (Lawler & Porter, 1967; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964). Given this model, the explanation for low correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism is very straightforward; in most organizations very few rewards or sanctions are perceived to be tied to attendance behaivors. Sick leave, personal leave policies, as well as a decrease in a general work ethic, that it is one's duty to attend the job one holds, all tend to decrease the contingency between behavior and rewards. Given the recent trends in company policies and practices, it may become even more difficult to find job satisfaction-absenteeism correlations in the future. Furthermore, we would predict that those who have found job satisfaction-absenteeism correlations in the past have done so primarily because the job environments were those in which rewards were contingent upon attendance. Since such contingencies usually aren't very strong, it is not surprising that the correlations of job satisfaction with absenteeism have been low.

The lack of support for the position that job satisfaction causes attendance does not imply that absence behavior is any less important or less researchable.

It does imply that a more efficacious approach to studying it must be undertaken than to merely correlate it with satisfaction measures. The data presented here suggest that attendance behavior should be viewed in light of the forces provided by role senders who may or may not be present in the job setting. These roles may be sent by the organization through company policies, the nature of the job, supervisors or co-workers, or by agents less under the control of the organization -- the individual's work values, his responsibilities, family, or warm spring days and nearby salmon running. The present data have shown that role pressures provided by the individual's value system, co-workers, and the job design do influence one or more forms of absence behavior. What is needed is a more comprhensive view of the sent roles as they relate to attendance behavior (Gibson, 1966; Hyman, 1955). Such an orientation would explore the link between agents as they influence the individual's perception of the role demands on his attendance behavior created by the rewards administered by these agents. As being present at work becomes more instrumental for the attainment of valued rewards, absenteeism should decrease. The focus of an organization interested in absenteeism behavior must be on those agents within the organization who can provide valued rewards for attendance behaviors. The concern with job satisfaction is only an indirect one. Whether or not job satisfaction correlates with absenteeism only depends upon whether they share a common third factor -- the attainment of valued rewards.

References

Baumgartel, H., & Sobol, R. Background and organizational factors in absenteeism. Personnel Psychology, 1959, 12, 431-443.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.

Burket, G. A study of reduced rank model for multiple prediction. Richmond, Virginia: William Byrd, 1964.

Cooper, R., & Payne, R. Age and absence: A longitudinal study in three firms. Occupational Psychology, 1965, 39, 31-43.

Dansereau, F., Cashmen, S., & Graen, G. Expectancy as a moderator of the relationship between job attitudes and turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 228-229.

Gibson, R. O. Toward a conceptualization of absence behavior of personnel in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 11, 107-133.

Graen, G. Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. Journal of Applied Psychology, Monograph, 1969, 53(2), Part 2, 1-25.

Health, Education, and Welfare. Work in America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1973.

Herman, J. B. Are situational contingencies limiting job attitude - job performance relationships? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 10, 208-224.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: Review of Research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Synderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Hyman, H. Survey design and analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Isambert-Jamati, V. Absenteeism among women workers in industry. International Labor Review, 1962, 85, 248-261.

Lawler, E. E. III, & Porter, L. W. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations, 1967, 7, 20-28.

Metzner, H., & Mann, F. Employee attitudes and absences. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 467-485.

Naylor, J. C., & Vincent, N. L. Predicting female absenteeism. Personnel Psychology, 1959, 12, 81-84.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. III. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1968.

Poter, L. W., & Steers, R. W. Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 151-176.

Pritchard, R. D., Kirk, R., & Mayo, R. Some data and comments on the relationship between performance and satisfaction. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, unpublished paper, 1975.

Triandis, H. T. Attitude and attitude change. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. Manual for Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 1967, XXII.